

FILED - USDC - NH
2025 MAR 27 AM 10:54

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW HAMPSHIRE**

Randall Collier

March 26th 2025

V.

NEW HAMPSHIRE CIRCUIT COURT FAMILY DIVISION ET AL.

Case No. 25-CV-36 SE-TSM

Motion for Reconsideration of Report and Recommendation.

The Misapprehension of Facts and Law by this Judiciary inadvertently or intentionally has led to unsupported findings in the Report and Recommendation.

I clearly expressed that my son T.C. was removed from my custody on 12/13/12. These acts were done by the NH Executive Branch Unconstitutional Circuit Court Family Division. I was ordered to comply with the Criminal Statute Protective Orders, or face Law Enforcement action for violations which may result in arrest and detention.

I was never referred to an Article III Constitutional Court for proper criminal prosecution by a jury of one's peers. This is known as MISPRISON, and Unconstitutional actions by the Article II Administrative Circuit Court.

This Habeas Corpus is on behalf of T.C. as he is Unlawfully and Unconstitutionally being detained from my custody and his rights to have intimate father son relationship is being denied as he did not commit a crime.

In 2013, I received Criminal Statute Protective Orders and Ms. May was awarded Sole Custody of T.C. Twelve (12) years ago I received 6 years of Supervised visits for "T.C's memory of his good relationship with his father". This was never completed, and later received a 5 year extension of the Protective order for a Christmas gift that I didn't send. I have had 6 hours in 12 years with my son and never committed a crime.

The NH Circuit Court is not a Court of Competent Jurisdiction. No Fitness Test was performed as required by Law. No Probable Cause, No Jury of one's peers, and No Mens Rea, No Rules of Evidence, and NOT a Judicial Court of Record or a Constitutional Court of Law. Preponderance of Evidence is not the Standard and neither is Proof beyond a Reasonable Doubt. NH Circuit Court Family Division is listed as a NH Executive Branch

Agency. NH Executive Branch using NH Judicial Branch Criminal Statutes, Judicial Case law, and Letterheads violates the Separation of Powers Doctrine.

I was never arrested, detained, or incarcerated. For twelve (12) years, T.C. has been Unlawfully and Unconstitutionally detained from my custody without findings from a Court of Competent Jurisdiction with proof beyond a Reasonable Doubt that T.C. or I am guilty of committing a crime.

I did receive two (2) Unconstitutional arrest warrants that were issued without a signed affidavit from an injured party. This is also known as Fraud on the legal system. However, I did pay \$2800.00 to remove the NH arrest warrant. During the pendency of the Protective Order/ Parenting Case,, both North Carolina and New Hampshire are guilty of issuing Unconstitutional arrest warrants allowing this Court Original and Diversity Jurisdiction. The Unconstitutional North Carolina Civil Order for Arrest is still open and valid.

NH Criminal Statutes were misapplied in this Unconstitutional Court on 2/4/13 ab initio. I never met the initial elements of NH RSA 633.4 as Required in NH Harassment RSA 644.4. See order on 1/27/13 "there were no findings of trying to take T.C. away from Ms. May or into the woods". I most certainly can not meet the elements of Criminal Harassment for "texting at all hours of the night" without the actual text messages being submitted into evidence. How does one meet criminal elements without the elements? I met the NH RSA 631.4 elements for Criminal Threatening without those elements too.

See Order 4/24 "Rules of Evidence do not apply and did not apply to the order Ms. Collier seeks to vacate". "This Court has Subject Matter Jurisdiction". "Rules of Evidence do not apply and the Standard of Proof is the Preponderance of Evidence rather than Proof Beyond a Reasonable Doubt".

How is there a Preponderance of evidence without the actual elements? This must be the standard of proof the State of NH is referring to. Evidence without proof.

NEW EVIDENCE on 3/12/2025. Ret. NH Supreme Court Justice and Chairman of the NH House Judiciary Committee, Chairman Lynn stated "The only way to get a Preponderance of Evidence is if you go to a legal proceeding and go to court". "That is how you get a Preponderance, not through civil litigation". The four(4) minute duration starting at the 57 minute mark is now submitted as "NEW EVIDENCE".

NEW EVIDENCE is on 3/24/25 Judge Lombardi of Laconia Family Court noted " This is a Statutory Court" in regards to a debate with Attny Moeckel and I. Attorney Moekel was representing and testifying for Ms. May who was present via the phone. This hearing was in regards to a third five(5) year extension. This will make a total of 17 years of protection order expiring when T.C. is 19 years old. This is Fraud on the Court and it was noted, and granted by Judge Lombardi. Judge Lombardi allowed Ms. May to be in North Carolina on her Motion to Extend the Protective Orders.

Attorney Moekel was arguing that this is a Constitutional Court. NH State House Legislative Investigations concluded NH Circuit Court Family Division does not provide protection for Constitutional Rights or Due Process. I did present to Laconia Family Court Judge Lombardi this video of Chairman Lynn speaking for the opening four minutes to also support not extending the protective order for another 5 years. Atty Moekel argued this was a Constitutional Court after viewing what Ret. NH Supreme Court Justice Lynn said. Apparently the NH Family Court is an Article III Constitutional Court, yet does follow the Rules of Evidence, or any standard to measure anything by, they don't use the strict scrutiny test but has "interest when parties don't agree". **If there are no rules and no evidence, what is the State of NH's interest as noted in the 4/24 order?**

Sponsors of the NH HB652 to Abolish the Family Court Bill were present as Court Watchers.

Apparently, the NH RSA 458 a. is superior and carries more weight than an Extraordinary Federal Writ of Habeas Corpus, per the NH Supreme Court, as this court noted.

I want to remind this body that an Unconstitutional Statutory Rule in or from an Article II Administrative Court of Equity has no power to enforce. This is not an Article III Judicial Court of Law or Record.

"A duty to give decisions which are advisory only, and so without force as judicial judgments, may be laid on a legislative court, but not on a constitutional court established under Art. III." Williams v. United States 289 U.S. 553 (1933),
<https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/289/553/> ;

For the purposes of review, it has been said that clear violations of laws on reaching the result, such as acting without evidence when evidence is required, or making a decision contrary to all the evidence, are just as much jurisdictional errors as is the failure to take proper steps to acquire jurisdiction at the beginning of the proceeding. Borgnis v. Falk Co., 133 N.W.209.
<https://case-law.vlex.com/vid/borgnis-v-falk-co-895259199>

I have exhausted all state remedies as required.

2 NH Supreme Court Discretionary Appeals for Parenting Plan denied

1 NH District Court 1983 Lawsuit dismissed Unconstitutionally on Rooker Feldman Doctrine

1 NH Supreme Court Writ of Certiorari denied

1 NH Dist. Court 1983 Lawsuit dismissed again on Rooker, Unconstitutionally

1 US Court of Appeals Brief accepted and denied Unconstitutionally

Violating Article 15 of the NH Constitution in regards to evidence most favorable to him on four (4) different occasions. 2 motions for Show Cause and 2 Motions for Discovery of Evidence against me were denied.

I was ordered that I "couldn't promise anything to T.C." This is a violation of 1st Amendment US Constitutional protections. I was ordered to relinquish all firearms which violate my 2nd Amendment US Constitutional Rights. I was ordered to undergo a mental health evaluation violating my 5th Amendment US Constitutional Right. 12 years of Criminal Protective Orders violate 8th Amendment US Constitutional Rights. 14th Amendment US Constitutional Right violations to family relations violations. 1st, 2nd, 4th, 5th, 6th, 8th, and 14th US Constitutional Rights are continuing to be violated as my son T.C. has been illegally taken from my custody and I have had no Redress and no speedy trial to date.

Prosecutorial Misconduct:

Using NH Criminal Statutes without evidence in Civil litigation

Using Judicial letterheads and Judicial Case Law in a non judicial proceeding.

Restricting Sovereign Americans Rights without supporting evidence of a crime or probable cause.

Judge Garner wrote in multiple different orders that the hearings complied with Due Process. This was after denying access to evidence most favorable to him (4x) as Required by 4th Amendment of the US Constitution and Article 15 of the NH Constitution.

Title 28 USC under § 1331.

The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States.

This is an Act of Congress as defined under § 1343.

§ 1343. Civil rights and elective franchise

(a) The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of any civil action authorized by law to be commenced by any person:

(1) To recover damages for injury to his person or property, or because of the deprivation of any right or privilege of a citizen of the United States, by any act done in furtherance of any conspiracy mentioned in section 1985 of Title 42;

(2) To recover damages from any person who fails to prevent or to aid in preventing any wrongs mentioned in section 1985 of Title 42 which he had knowledge were about to occur and power to prevent;

(3) To redress the deprivation, under color of any State law, statute, ordinance, regulation, custom or usage, of any right, privilege or immunity secured by the Constitution of the United States or by any Act of Congress providing for equal rights of citizens or of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States;

A writ of habeas corpus is a type of "extraordinary writ" that's used to challenge unlawful detention or imprisonment. It's a fundamental tool for protecting individual rights and liberties. How it works : A writ of habeas corpus requires a person in custody to be brought before a judge or court .The person in custody can then challenge their detention

- The writ is used to ensure that individuals are not unlawfully detained. Common grounds for a writ of habeas corpus
- New evidence that points to innocence
- Changes in the law
- Ineffective assistance of counsel
- Conviction under unconstitutional law
- Prosecutorial misconduct
- No jurisdiction

History

- The writ of habeas corpus originated in the 1200s as part of the Magna Carta
 - It was historically issued by English courts to control inferior courts and public authorities
- Other extraordinary writs quo warranto, prohibito, mandamus, procedendo, and certiorari.

The presumption of innocence is a legal principle that every person accused of any crime is considered innocent until proven guilty. Under the presumption of innocence, the legal burden of proof is thus on the prosecution, which must present compelling evidence to the trier of fact (a judge or a jury). If the prosecution does not prove the charges true, then the person is acquitted of the charges. The prosecution must in most cases prove that the accused is guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. If reasonable doubt remains, the accused must be acquitted. The opposite system is a presumption of guilt.

In many countries and under many legal systems, including common law and civil law systems (not to be confused with the other kind of civil law, which deals with non-criminal legal issues), the presumption of innocence is a legal right of the accused in a criminal trial. It is also an international human right under the UN's Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 11.

International human rights standards[edit]

Article 3 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights provides that "everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person". Article 5 of the European Convention on Human Rights goes further and calls for persons detained to have the right to challenge their detention, providing at article 5.4:

Everyone who is deprived of his liberty by arrest or detention shall be entitled to take proceedings by which the lawfulness of his detention shall be decided speedily by a court and his release ordered if the detention is not lawful.

Habeas corpus has certain limitations. The petitioner must present a prima facie case that a person has been unlawfully restrained. As a procedural remedy, it applies when detention results from neglect of legal process, but not when the lawfulness of the process itself is in question. In some countries, the writ has been temporarily or permanently suspended on the basis of a war or state of emergency, for example with the Habeas Corpus Suspension Act 1794 in Britain and the Habeas Corpus Suspension Act (1863) in the United States. The right to petition for a writ of habeas corpus has nonetheless long been celebrated as the most efficient safeguard of the liberty of the subject. The English jurist Albert Venn Dicey wrote that the British

Habeas Corpus Acts "declare no principle and define no rights, but they are for practical purposes worth a hundred constitutional articles guaranteeing individual liberty".^[5] The writ of habeas corpus is one of what are called the "extraordinary", "common law", or "prerogative writs", which were historically issued by the English courts in the name of the monarch to control inferior courts and public authorities within the kingdom. The most common of the other such prerogative writs are quo warranto, prohibito, mandamus, procedendo, and certiorari. The due process for such petitions is not simply civil or criminal, because they incorporate the presumption of non-authority. The official who is the respondent must prove authority to do or not do something. Failing that, the court must decide for the petitioner, who may be any person, not just an interested party. This differs from a motion in a civil process in which the movant must have standing, and bears the burden of proof.

Etymology^[edit]

The phrase is from the Latin habeās, second person singular present subjunctive active of habēre, "to have", "to hold"; and corpus, accusative singular of corpus, "body". In reference to more than one person, the phrase is habeas corpora.

Literally, the phrase means "[we command] that you should have the [detainee's] body [brought to court]"; that is, that the detainee be brought to court in person. The complete phrase habeas corpus [coram nobis] ad subjiciendum means "that you have the person [before us] for the purpose of subjecting (the case to examination)". Those are the words of writs included in a 14th-century Anglo-French document requiring a person be brought before a court or judge--especially to determine whether the person is being detained legally.^[6]

Habeas corpus is one of the earliest common law writs.

In its simplest form a writ of habeas corpus requires that a person who is in custody be brought before a judge or court and that they be able to challenge that custody. The writ of habeas corpus is used to attack unlawful detention or illegal imprisonment.

I am challenging the Unlawful and Unconstitutional detention of T.C from my custody without Due Process. This Administrative process was through inferior state courts and statutes. Inferior courts are not protecting US Constitutional Rights as Required by Oath and Law.

Habeas corpus is still an effective remedy at the federal level where a petition for writ of habeas corpus can be used to challenge both federal and state detentions where the detention may be in violation of federal law or federal constitutional protections.

Federal statutes 28 U.S.C. §§ 2241–2256 provides for a Federal court to issue a writ of habeas corpus for people who are convicted in Federal court of Federal crimes, or people who were convicted in State court for State crimes. Both types of Federal habeas corpus petitions can be based on a violation of the rights guaranteed by the United States Constitution or Federal law.

MAIN ARGUMENTS SUPPORTING THIS HABEAS:

1) The US Dist.Ct. in both Prev. Case failed to respond to any of the "15" claims/allegations but only dismissed based on the "recommendation" of the "Magistrate" to dismiss the entire case

based upon "Rooker-Feldman Doctrine", Despite the US.Appels.Ct. in Behr v. Campbell, which was cited in my Response to the Motion to Dismiss, REQUIRES all courts to actually explain why each claim is being dismissed (or not), one at a time!

2) "Courts of Law" in the U.S.A. REQUIRE a proper conviction of an actual "crime" against a child's individual Human rights by a parent before they may "Lawfully" interfere with a parents rights to raise their child as they see fit, at all! This is a "deprivation of rights under color of law" and a violation of "due process of law" and "parental rights", the way these NH "Family Courts" are violating "due process of law".

3) Procedural due process violations based upon the use of falsified information as a basis for the proceedings: The allegations used to infringe this Plaintiffs Parental Rights (with a "protective order" still active 12 years and counting, sole decision making, and sole custody in favor of the mother, effectively removing my ability to mutually raise our biological son), were based upon "hearsay" and not "probable cause" and there was no "trial by jury" in these NH "Family Courts", or "proof beyond any reasonable doubt", in a proper "criminal prosecution", as required by "the supreme Law of the Land" and "common law", before infringing on my Parental rights. Therefore all orders from this "Family Court" like this "protective order" and custody order were not legitimate or lawful to begin with, because the procedures of this NH "Family Court" are violating "fundamental principles" of "the supreme Law of the Land" and "common law" as described herein. These procedures fundamentally violate the Mission Statement to follow the NH and US Constitutions.

4) During the House Special Committee on the Family Division of the Circuit Court (05/02/23)", https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jVjJumYj6_w - "These Family Courts were created by statute". See 2hrs and 2h17m, Randall Collier and Paula Werme speaking]), not by State Constitution as required to make them legitimate "courts of law". Furthermore they are not "criminal courts" therefore they do not have "Lawful" "Authority" to conduct any "criminal prosecutions" or "searches and[/or] seizures" to begin with, making all of the court processes in these "Family Court" cases "unconstitutional" and "null and void", "ab initio" (from the beginning). "making all their Orders and actions "in legal contemplation as inoperative as though it had never been passed" (US.Supr.Ct., Norton v. Shelby).

. See "House Special Committee on the Family Division of the Circuit Court (05/02/23)", https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jVjJumYj6_w (see 2hrs and 2h17m, Randall Collier and Paula Werme speaking). : "...AN ACT establishing the New Hampshire circuit court to replace the current probate courts, district courts, and judicial branch family division. ... Approved: May 16, 2011", "Effective Date: July 1, 2011", <https://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/legislation/2011/HB0609.html>;

See also, House Judiciary Committee meeting on 1/17/24 At the 5hr 21 minutes, NH State Rep Smith and Co-chair of the Judiciary Committee asks the General Counsel Erin Kregan "is the

Supreme Court the only Constitutional Court in NH?" The General Counsel's response was "Superior Court is also a constitutional created court". Rep Smith then asked, "What about Circuit Court?" The General Counsel's response was "Circuit Courts were made by statute.". House Judiciary (01/17/2024): <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bRBjoHcXrek>
See US Supreme Court Decision [self v. Rhay, 61 wn (2d) 261] "Statutes are not the Law".

5) Negligence for using criminal statutes against litigants in civil court:

- a) If there was probable evidence of an actual crime these 'family courts' are liable for not reporting to an actual criminal court;
- b) Only criminal courts are supposed to be prosecuting criminal codes, not these "family courts" (which are not legit to start as explained in the prev. reason #4 herein);
- c) A "civil sanction" is different from a "criminal code/law/statute". Criminal law in NH is only Title 62 (Sections 625-651 only, not 173b) and in US Codes only Title 18;
- d) So these "Family Courts" are not legitimate to begin with, and may only aid people in resolving disputes between them if they are both willing to VOLUNTARILY submit to the courts orders, but these "Family Courts" are not "Criminal Courts of Law" and therefore cannot "lawfully" force any orders upon anyone against their will (like "protective orders" which must come from a "criminal court" according to "due process of law" like "probable cause", "trial by jury", and "proof beyond any reasonable doubt");

6) House Judiciary Committee meeting on 1/17/24 NH State Rep Kutab, stated "The Judicial Conduct Commission was made by legislation. The Judicial Conduct Committee was established by NH Supreme Court Rule. The NH Supreme Court found the Judicial Conduct Commission to be unconstitutional in 2011" Rep Kutab, stated "the Judicial Conduct Commission has been on the books for over 20 years, its not used, it has been confusing litigants because it has the same initials as the Judicial Conduct Committee, which is the process pro se litigants use when they have complaints against family court judges".

House Judiciary (01/17/2024): <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bRBjoHcXrek>

I recently obtained a document from the Judicial Conduct Committee that notes they do not have jurisdiction to hear Administrative Court Judge complaints". Today 3/25/25 at the Children and Family Law Committee, the State of NH again reiterated "litigants are referred to the NH JCC for complaints against family Court Judges". The State of New Hampshire is still intentionally misleading litigants about complaints. This is intentional Treason against We The People!

7) House Judiciary and Family law Committee hearing on 3/28/23 Judge Michael Garner testified that Rules of Evidence do not apply in Family Court, what we hope to be is the gatekeeper of reliable information". <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vbFOdcRT> *

Question of Law:

If the Rules of Evidence applied, the information would be reliable. If Rules of Evidence do not apply, the information is unreliable by definition. It can't be reliable and unreliable at the same

time. Misleading testimony by Judge Garner to the Judiciary is in the best interest of the children?

8) We cannot 'vindicate' our 'rights' in "Family Court(s)" if "rules of evidence do not apply": During the House Special Committee of Family Division of the Circuit Court: on 4/2/24 NH General Counsel Erin Kregan stated "civil court is for the plaintiff to vindicate their rights, and in criminal court the burden of proof is much higher, the rights of the defendant are protected". "Civil sanctions are not meant to be punitive, they are intended for the plaintiff to vindicate their rights". House Special Committee on the Family Division of the Circuit Court (04/02/2024): <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WPPyUg3Ua3E>

NH Criminal Statutes used as civil sanctions against pro se litigants: See NH RSA 173b, The Chairman of the House Judiciary recently stated "Preponderance of Evidence" can only come from a legal proceeding in a court and not through civil litigation. Since the Standard of Proof is not the Preponderance as previously noted, now there is no legally documented or lawfully obtained standard to support anything. If rules and evidence don't apply, how would one vindicate their Rights ?

This DV Protective Order must be overturned and dismissed, return Full Custody of T.C. Immediately and full restitution of all fees paid to date.

Est. \$110,000.00 Child Support

Est. \$83,000.00 personal legal aid

Est. \$10,000.00 Ordered legal fees

Est. \$2800.00 paid arrest warrant

Est. \$2500.00 all court fees combined

Est. total of \$205,000.00 to be reimbursed.

This does not include penalties and mandatory compensation.

9) Negligence for failing to lawfully allow evidence most favorable to [this Plaintiff] as required by law: Deprivations of rights to "due process of law"[A.5] for the judge denying access to video surveillance tapes from the court regarding meeting the elements of "criminal threatening"[117], for 2 years in a row (denying motions for "discovery" of evidence to defend against charges of "criminal threatening".

10) See 2024 US Supreme Court Case(b) wherein the Chevron Doctrine was recently overruled, and see youtube video(a): "Why Overturning Chevron Was A Fantastic Supreme Court Ruling: Steve Forbes": Chevron was an abuse of power, and a problem for the separation of powers, which undermined Congress and the US Constitution, and allowed administrative agencies the power to interpret law instead of the courts. At 2:20min Steve Forbes says: "The list of abuses is enormous, and getting worse."

(a)=Why Overturning Chevron Was A Fantastic Supreme Court Ruling: Steve Forbes:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DjnHlr1KjI>

(b)=[https://www.whitecase.com/insight-alert/us-supreme-court-strikes-down-chevron-doctrine-what-you-need-know#:~:text=On%20June%2028%2C%202024%2C%20the,interpretations%20of%20ambiguous%20federal%20laws](https://www.whitecase.com/insight-alert/us-supreme-court-strikes-down-chevron-doctrine-what-you-need-know#:~:text=On%20June%2028%2C%202024%2C%20the,interpretations%20of%20ambiguous%20federal%20laws.). Also see:
https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/chevron_deference

11) SEC v. Jarkesy, 603 U.S. _ (2024): "In 2013, the Securities and Exchange Commission initiated an enforcement action against respondents George Jarkesy, Jr., and Patriot28, LLC, seeking civil penalties for alleged securities fraud. The SEC chose to adjudicate the matter in-house before one of its administrative law judges, rather than in federal court where respondents could have proceeded before a jury."
<https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/603/22-859/>

12) Social Security Act 1935 (d): "(d) Nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing any Federal official, agent, or representative, in carrying out any of the provisions of this Act, to take charge of any child over the objection of either of the parents of such child, or of the person standing in loco parentis to such child." <https://www.ssa.gov/history/35act.html>

Standard of Review:

"The essential elements of due process are notice and opportunity to defend" ones self. US.Supreme Ct., Simon v. Craft, 182 U.S. 427 (1901),
<https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/118/425/>;

"It is only when failure to observe this safeguard amounts to denial of due process, that the court is deprived of jurisdiction."; Merritt v. Hunter, C.A. Kansas 170 F2d 739,*
<https://law.justia.com/cases/federal/appellate-courts/F2/170/739/1567905/>
See NH rule 2.2 Rules of Evidence do not apply.

"No sanction can be imposed absent proof of jurisdiction". Standard v. Olesen, 74 S.Ct.768. <https://casetext.com/case/olesen-v-stanard>

Without jurisdiction, the acts or judgments of the court are void and open to collateral attack. McLean v. Jephson, 123 N.Y. 142, 25 N.E. 409.
<https://casetext.com/case/mclean-v-jephson>

Securities Fraud Behind Court Cases:

1. Courts as Fraudulent Trading Venues

- Courts are not judicial venues but private securities trading centers operating under corporate administrative law.
- Every court case is a securitized financial transaction, not a pursuit of justice.
- Ministerial administrators act as securities traders, monetizing case bonds instead of ensuring impartial justice.

2. Securities Fraud and the Monetization of Cases

- A case number creates a securities trust, where the court acts as the depository institution.

- Indictments, warrants, and summonses function as securities futures (financial bets against future performance).
 - Signing an appearance bond converts the accused into a trustee and surety, placing them as financial collateral for the case.
3. Clearfield Doctrine 2008: Courts Are Private Corporations
- Clearfield Doctrine (2008) states that governments acting as corporations lose sovereign immunity and must operate as private businesses.
 - Courts trade in securities unlawfully without a securities license, violating U.S. securities laws.
 - Ministerial administrators have a direct financial incentive to rule against defendants, ensuring continued revenue generation.
4. The Constitutional Violation: Courts Cannot Charge Costs or Fees
- In the U.S., Marbury v. Madison (1803) states that anything repugnant to the Constitution is null and void.
 - Murdock v. Pennsylvania (1943) confirmed that no state can convert a right into a privilege and issue a fee for it.
5. Courts as Debt Collectors and Tax Fraud Enablers
- Courts act as debt collectors for private corporations, funneling funds through Cestui Que Vie Trusts and Birth Certificate Bonds.
 - By demanding payment through fines, fees, and court costs, they engage in fraudulent tax evasion.
 - These unlawful conversions violate Shuttlesworth v. Birmingham (1969), which states that if the government converts a right into a privilege, men and women may ignore it with impunity.
6. The BAR's Role in the Fraud
- Lawyers and ministerial administrators are members of the private BAR guild, enforcing corporate rules disguised as law.
 - They engage in malfeasance, personation fraud, and identity theft by assuming jurisdiction they do not lawfully have.
 - **Justice Gorsuch has confirmed that an attorney cannot act as both a witness and legal counsel, exposing further fraud in court proceedings.**
 - The entire judicial system operates as a racketeering entity under RICO violations.
- Conclusion: Trump Must Act to Restore Lawful Justice
- With no jury, no constitutional authority, and unlawful money trading, all judicial decisions under this fraudulent system are null and void.



Under Duress,

Randall S. Collier

26 Joslin Rd

Surry, NH

03431

603 803 2648